

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: And certainly that would be very true I think with regard to small parcels or slivers or footage here and there. But I guess it's...if you're talking about a larger parcel, it maybe raises a couple of questions. And I wanted to explore that. I don't know for sure how I feel about it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Warner, if I may ask, how important are those four lines, 24 through 27? I mean is that something that could be discussed in more detail next year or is that pretty important to this bill for some reason or?

SENATOR WARNER: Well, it was important to the...it was in the bill as introduced, the concept. It was important to the people who appeared and the NRD that appeared and the owners who appeared. It was ..

SENATOR BEUTLER: It just...if I'm following what's likely to happen in this kind of situation, if I was following your conversation with Senator Bromm, what would happen would be that the taxing entities as a whole would not get the recaptured money.

SENATOR WARNER: That's correct.

SENATOR BEUTLER: But probably the benefit of not paying that recaptured portion would be presumably negotiated and split between the landowner and the particular public entity that was purchasing the problem...purchasing the property. Would that be a fair assessment of what?

SENATOR WARNER: I think part of the argument, I doubt if it would be negotiated if it was eminent domain.

SENATOR BEUTLER: You doubt if they would negotiate it?

SENATOR WARNER: If it was eminent domain, it would not be negotiated. They could negotiate before eminent domain took effect I guess.